



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,680	02/05/2001	Shinya Matsuda	44084-490	3525

7590 07/01/2005
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

LEE, CHEUKFAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/775,680	Applicant(s) MATSUDA, SHINYA	
	Examiner Cheukfan Lee	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/5/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2622

1. Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 12, and 17 are independent.

2. The abstract is objected to because of the following:

The abstract is not in the form of a single paragraph but in two paragraphs. A proper abstract is in form of a single paragraph.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. Claims 5 and 6 are objected to because of the following:

In claim 5, line 3 of the claim, "the instructions" lacks antecedent basis. The word "the" should be deleted.

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent on the objected claim 5.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2622

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheatle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,396).

Cheatle discloses a document image input/output system comprising an input device (camera 2, Fig. 1) for sequentially inputting a plurality of partial images (tiles) of a document (10), and a display for displaying an entire image of the document (col. 6, lines 28-30). Although not explicitly discussed by Cheatle, it is inherent that the display has a plurality of pixels arranged in a matrix for displaying the entire image of the document (10). Further, though not explicitly discussed by Cheatle, it is also inherent that the display displays the entire image of the document constructed by pasting the plurality of partial images since the input image is a composite image of the partial images of the document (10). Furthermore, it is inherent that the display sequentially outputs image from one edge of the matrix of the plurality of pixels of the display to the opposed edge thereof.

As to the displaying of a previously inputted image before the input of all of the partial images of the entire document is complete, though Cheatle does not disclose such detail, one of ordinary skill in the art would have realized that the display of Cheatle is not only for displaying the partial images of the document (10) but also for displaying previously inputted images since the display is connected to the controller

Art Unit: 2622

unit (32) (to which the camera 2 is connected) having a microprocessor (40) and a memory (RAM 41) (Cheatle, col. 6, lines 18-25). One of ordinary skill in the art would have known that the controller unit (32) has the capability to store data corresponding to the previously inputted image and the capability of displaying the previously inputted image before inputting the partial images of the document (10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to cause the display to display the previously inputted image before the input of all of the partial images of the entire document (10) is complete in order to present to the user more images besides the images of the document (10).

6. Claims 1-4 and 7-16 are allowed.

7. Claims 5 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection(s) set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Independent claim 1 require that the processor variously sets a reading sequence for reading of a plurality of the partial areas of the specific region, and the controller controls the image sensing unit to read the partial areas in the set reading sequence. The closest prior art Cheatle (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,396) does not teach this combination of features. Cheatle discloses moves the actuator (25) and thus the

Art Unit: 2622

camera (2) to read the partial areas (tiles) of the document (10) in a predetermined pattern (col. 6, lines 35-40). However, the pattern is not variously set.

The reference Slatter (U.S. patent No. 6,904,183) discloses reading partial areas of a document in a more than one predetermined sequence (col. 10, lines 23-32). However, Slatter filed February 15, 2001 is not prior art for the present application having an effective filing date of February 5, 2001.

Claims 2-6 depending on claim 1 are/would be allowable for the reason given for claim 1.

Independent claim 7 requires a controller for variously controlling the predetermined sequence in which the optical images of a plurality of sections of the specific region are directed. This feature of variously controlling the predetermined sequence by the controller, in combination with other limitations, is not taught by the closest prior art Cheatle (6,771,396) discussed above.

Claims 8-11 depending on claim 7 are allowable for the reason given for claim 7.

Independent claim 12 requires that the input device input the plurality of partial images of the document in a predetermined sequence, the predetermined sequence being dependent on the orientation of the sheet onto which the image is outputted. This feature in combination with other limitations of claim 12 is not taught by the prior art of record, including Cheatle (6,771,396) discussed above.

Art Unit: 2622

Claims 13-16 depending on claim 12 are allowable for the reason given for claim 13.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Slatter (U.S. Patent No. 6,904,183) discloses an image capture system for capturing a plurality of partial images of a document.

Ishida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,639,625) discloses an image-sensing device for sensing a plurality of partial images of a region and combining the partial images to form a composite image on a single sheet.

Matsuda (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,643) discloses an imaging device and imaging method.

Okada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,727,954) discloses an electronic camera and image processing system.

Dance et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,539) discloses a document periscope.

Nakao (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,819) discloses an image input system.

Art Unit: 2622

Slatter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,540,415) discloses a document capture stand for a digital camera having a display for displaying captured images (Fig. 7).

Grise et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,663,806) discloses a non-destructive target marking for image stitching.

Pilu (U.S. Patent No. 6,885,479) discloses a curled surface imaging system.

Nakao (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,001) discloses a device and computer-readable medium for image position adjustment for use with a display device (Fig. 4).

Grosvenor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,847,379) discloses a display for displaying static digital images.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheukfan Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7407. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cheukfan Lee
June 19, 2005


Cheukfan Lee